

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/687,508	10/15/2003	Peijun Jiang	2002B140/2	9030
23455	7590 10/03/2005		EXAMINER	
	BIL CHEMICAL COM	· LU, C CAIXIA		
5200 BAYWA P.O. BOX 214	··		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149			1713	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W ID

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/687,508	JIANG ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Caixia Lu	1713			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vorce Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 A	<u>ugust 2005</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the me					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-108 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3 and 5-108 is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 	withdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposite and a composite an	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	_				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities in the previous Office action:

--Throughout the working examples, in at least Examples 9-15, 48-51, 52-57, 58-60, and 61-66, the "catalyst ratio" of the two catalyst is defined by "molar percent". This is illogical since a molar percentage is not a ratio. --

Applicants have amended the "catalyst ratio" to "catalyst mix". However, such a amendment is still improper in that it is not clear what the "molar percent" represents and based on. The examiner suggests to delete the portion regarding the catalyst molar percentages since the relative amounts of catalysts used in the polymerization process are disclosed in the corresponding Tables.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun et al. (US 6,800,700) for the same rationale as set forth in the previous Office action mailed June 1, 2005.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 31, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First of all, applicants' assertion of "Sun is directed to using two otherwise unusable materials" is erroneous because <u>Sun's patent is about how to prepare the</u>

Application/Control Number: 10/687,508

Art Unit: 1713

normally sticky, tenacious polyolefin which is not possible to prepare by conventional methods. Sun's sticky, tenacious polypropylenes have to be tacky.

Applicants also assert that Sun's polypropylene must be high molecular weight since it is prepared at 50 °C. It is the examiner's position that the molecular weight of polyolefin are affected by many factors in the polymerization process such as catalyst, the ratio of catalyst to cocatalyst, monomer concentration, the amount of chain transfer agent, polymerization time and temperature, etc. rather than just by the polymerization temperature. Polymerization temperature of 50 °C does not guarantee high molecular weight. As a matter of fact, the type of catalyst and the catalyst/cocatalyst ratio have more propound influences on the molecular weight. Contrary to applicants' assertion, Sun's polypropylene must have low molecular due to the fact that Sun's polypropylenes are sticky. A high molecular weight amorphous polypropylene is a non-sticky transparent material. As indicated in the previous rejections, the burden is on the applicants to proof that the polypropylenes of Sun's working examples have molecular weight above the range of the instant claims. Since Sun's polypropylene are amorphous and expected to have molecular weight in the range of the instant claims, Sun's polypropylene are expected to be substantially identical to the olefin polymer of the instant claims and thus to have strength similar in the range of the instant claims.

In view of the foregoing, the instant claims are still deemed to be proper and thus maintained.

Application/Control Number: 10/687,508 Page 4

Art Unit: 1713

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful and the matter is urgent, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571) 272-1114. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner September 28, 2005